



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/015,530 | 12/12/2001 | Robert T. Plunkett | 046301-046000 | 7763 |

70604 7590 09/15/2009
NIXON PEABODY LLP
401 9TH STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

LI, AIMEE J

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2183

| | |
|-----------|---------------|
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-----------|---------------|

09/15/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/015,530 | PLUNKETT ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | AIMEE J. LI | 2183 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) AIMEE J. LI. (3) Paul Master (Inventor).
 (2) Wayne L. Tang (Reg. No. 36,028). (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 08 September 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-21 and 23-25.

Identification of prior art discussed: Gove (USP 5,212,777).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants' representative, Applicant, and the Examiner discussed the current rejection of the claims, and the differences between the invention and the art cited in the rejection. The Examiner indicated areas with unclear meanings in the claim, such as "heterogeneous computational elements" and "group", which are key differences the Examiner believed were not clearly set forth in the claim.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Aimee J Li/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2183